

ONS000166
PATENT

S.N. 09/845,114

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-14, 16, and 18-20 remain in the application.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Office Action states that claims 3, 4, 10-13, 17, and 19 were objected to as being depend on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of prior claim 3 and intervening claim 2. It is believed that this amendment to claim 1 places claim 1 in condition for allowance by incorporating the limitations of claim 3 as stated in the Office Action.

By this amendment, claim 8 is amended to include the limitations of prior claim 10 and intervening claim 9. It is believed that this amendment to claim 8 places claim 8 in condition for allowance by incorporating the limitations of claim 10 as stated in the Office Action.

By this amendment, claim 14 is amended to include the limitations of prior claim 17 and intervening claim 15. It is believed that this amendment to claim 14 places claim 14 in condition for allowance by incorporating the limitations of claim 17 as stated in the Office Action.

Claims 4 and 5 were amended to provide antecedent correlation to amended claim 1.

Claim 11 was amended to provide antecedent correlation to amended claim 8 and to correct a typographical error.

Claim 16 was amended to provide antecedent correlation to amended claim 14.

ONS000166
PATENT

S.N. 09/845,114

35 USC 102 Rejection:

Claims 14-16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over U.S. patent no. 6,497,370 issued to Moreaux.

Since the amendments to claim 14 now place claim 14 in condition for allowance as explained hereinbefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claim 14 is now moot.

Claims 16, 18, and 20 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 1, 2, and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,497,370 issued to Moreaux in view of U.S. patent no. 6,138,029 issued to Digabel.

Since the amendments to claim 1 now place claim 1 in condition for allowance as explained hereinbefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claim 1 is now moot.

Claims 4-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Since the amendments to claim 8 now place claim 8 in condition for allowance as explained hereinbefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claim 8 is now moot.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

ONS000166
PATENT

S.N. 09/845,114

CONCLUSION

Applicant(s) made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of all of the above, it is believed that the claims are allowable, and that the case is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Although it is believed that no fees are due for this amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1086.

If there are matters which can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney/agent at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
Dominique Omet, by

Robert F. Hightower

ON Semiconductor
Law Dept./MD A700
P.O. Box 62890
Phoenix, AZ 85082-2890

Robert F. Hightower
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36163
Tel. (602) 244-5603